DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 767 SO 018 412

AUTHOR Mei, Dolores M.; And Others
TITLE Police/School Liaison Project: 1985-86. End-of-Year Report. OEA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 30p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Cooperation; Community Resources; Court Role; Educational Assessment; Grade 11; Grade 12; High Schools; *Law Related Education; Outcomes of Education; *Police School Relationship; Program Evaluation; *Social Studies; Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This document is an assessment of the effectiveness of the Policy/School Liaison Program (PSLP), which began in 1982. PSLP offered 11th and 12th graders a one-semester, law-related education course. The 1985-86 PSLP was designed to expand the program and to develop materials necessary to expedite program institutionalization. A curriculum manual and a videotape for classroom use was developed in July, 1986. The report consists of four chapters. Chapter one contains program background and scope of the evaluation. Chapter two is a description of program implementation. Chapter three is an analysis of student outcomes for the attitude survey and criminal justice examination. Chapter four contains conclusions and recommendations. The findings indicate that the program met its objectives of establishing partnerships with educational agencies; training teachers and police officers in course content, methods, and materials; and developing curriculum materials, but did not meet its objective of improving student attitudes toward the legal system. Recommendations include: (1) prioritizing course requirements; and (2) using a control group of non-program students to assess change in student attitudes. Appended is an item analysis of the PSLP Attitude Survey and Criminal Justice Examination. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Evaluation Section Report
Robert Tobias, Administrator
John E. Schoener, Senior Manager

April, 1987

POLICE/SCHOOL LIAISON PROJECT
1985-86
END-OF-YEAR REPORT

Prepared By The High
School Evaluation Unit

Dolores M. Mei,
Evaluation Manager

James T. Langlois and
Jan Rosenblum
Evaluation Associates

Elly Bulkin,
Evaluation Consultant

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

It is the policy of the Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, national origin, age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex, in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact: Carole Guerra, Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator, Office of Educational Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Room 743, Brooklyn, New York 11201. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to: Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York; or the Director, Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

SUMMARY

The 1985-86 Police/School Liaison Program (P.S.L.P.) offered eleventh and twelfth graders a one-semester law-related education course. A social studies teacher and a police officer from the local precinct team taught one or two classes at each of 63 public and eight private high schools. Approximately 3,000 students took part each term. In January and July, 1986, teachers and police officers participated in staff training workshops.

Conclusions about the success of P.S.L.P. in meeting its objectives are limited by the fact that the Office of Educational Assessment/High School Evaluation Unit could only assess the program retrospectively. The program met its objectives of establishing partnerships with educational agencies, training teachers and police officers in course content, methods, and materials, and developing curriculum materials and did not meet its objective of improving students' attitudes toward the legal system.

On a program-developed and administered attitude survey and content test, students did not show any statistically-significant improvement in their attitudes toward the legal system. Although program students improved their knowledge of legal issues, testing procedures made the meaning of these findings ambiguous. Flaws in the attitude survey itself and in the administration of both the survey and the criminal justice examination raised questions about the validity of survey and examination results. The failure to have a control group of non-program students complete the survey and the knowledge examination made it impossible to assess whether changes were due to program participation or to other unrelated factors.

Although the program's nearly 1,000-page guide contains a wealth of useful material, it has shortcomings. While allowing teachers opportunities for flexibility and creativity, the guide does not give a clear shape to the course. It does not indicate which of its many lessons are priorities and which should be only supplemental. It contains lessons with so much content that they are actually units which could take from several days to several weeks to teach. The videotape lacked certain production qualities needed to convey its incidents in a way that was both clear and involving for students. These problems reduce its effectiveness as a stimulus for classroom discussion.

On the basis of the evaluation findings, the following recommendations are aimed at enhancing program benefits:

- The curriculum guide should be revised to stipulate course priorities and requirements and indicate the approximate number of class periods needed to complete each lesson.

- Any attempts to assess changes in students' attitudes or knowledge should involve both program students and a control group of non-program students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. Introduction	
Program Background	1
Program Objectives	1
Scope of The Evaluation	2
Scope of This Report	3
II. Program Implementation	4
Program Overview	4
Training	5
Curriculum Development	7
III. Student Outcomes	10
Attitude Survey	10
Criminal Justice Examination	11
IV. Conclusions and Recommendations	13
APPENDIX: Item Analysis of P./S.L.P. Attitude Survey and Criminal Justice Examination	16

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The Police/School Liaison Program (P.S.L.P.), which began in 1982, offered eleventh and twelfth graders a one-semester, law-related education course. A social studies teacher and a police officer from the local precinct teamed to teach one or two classes at each of 63 public and eight private high schools. Approximately 3,000 students took part each term. In January and July, 1986, teachers and police officers participated in staff training workshops. After the end of the program year, staff completed a curriculum manual and a videotape for classroom use.

During the summer of 1982, P.S.L.P. developed an 800-page curriculum for use in its social studies elective classes. In 1982 through 1985, the P.S.L.P. operated in 34 New York City public and private high schools. The 1985-86 P.S.L.P. was designed to expand the program and to develop material necessary to expedite program institutionalization.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The original goals of the program, which were based on a proposed start-up date of August, 1985, were as follows:

- to establish partnerships with public and private educational agencies promulgating law-related education;
- to develop student knowledge about the U.S. system of law and law enforcement agencies;
- to improve student attitudes toward school, the law, and law enforcement agencies;
- to train teachers and police officers in the P.S.L.P.'s course content, methods, and materials;

- o to develop curriculum materials; and
- o to distribute the P.S.L.P.'s course of study, methods, and materials to other educational systems.

Project funding did not arrive until the beginning of October, 1985. As a result, no curriculum development took place during summer, 1985, leading P.S.L.P. to drop the sixth objective.

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

In June, 1986, the P.S.L.P. program director first informed the Office of Educational Assessment/High School Evaluation Unit (O.E.A./H.S.E.U.) that he had included an O.E.A./H.S.E.U. evaluation in the proposal that was funded for the 1985-86 school year. At that time, he indicated that he would let O.E.A./H.S.E.U. know the schedule and location of the summer, 1986 staff development activities; however, he did not contact O.E.A./H.S.E.U. until the second of four days of workshops.

The late notification severely limited the scope of the O.E.A./H.S.E.U. evaluation of P.S.L.P. This report is based on data obtained from interviews with the program director, a site visit to a staff development workshop, an examination of curriculum materials, and an analysis of pretest and posttest attitude surveys and criminal justice examinations.

Program administrators developed both the attitude survey and criminal justice examination without input from O.E.A./H.S.E.U. staff. However, the program director requested that

O.E.A./H.S.E.U. staff analyze the statistical reliability of these measures.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

The O.E.A./H.S.E.U. report of the 1985-86 P./S.L.P. evaluation consists of four chapters. Chapter I contains program background and scope of the evaluation. Chapter II is a description of program implementation. Chapter III is an analysis of student outcomes for the attitude survey and criminal justice examination. Chapter IV contains conclusions and recommendations.

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The P.S.L.P. proposal stipulated that the program begin in summer, 1985 with the development of curriculum which would then be field tested and distributed during the 1985-86 school year. The late arrival of funding altered this sequence. The program actually operated from October 1, 1985 to September 30, 1986. Classes took place prior to the development of the new curriculum. Teachers, therefore, had to rely on previously-developed curriculum, rather than being able to field test new material. Curriculum development was postponed until summer, 1986.

According to program records, P.S.L.P. classes met in 63 public high schools. At 51 percent of these schools, a team consisting of a police officer and a social studies teacher offered two P.S.L.P. classes; at the rest of the schools, they offered a single class. Assigned full-time to a school, each police officer co-taught a P.S.L.P. class three or four times a week. The remainder of their time was spent providing a police presence in the school. Approximately 3,000 students participated each term. The number of students registered for each class ranged from 15 to 68, with an average class register of 32.

One program goal was to establish partnerships with educational agencies and public and private agencies promulgating law-related education. O.E.A./H.S.E.U. could only assess the program's success in meeting this goal retrospectively on the

basis of information provided by the program director. He reported that P./S.L.P. established partnership activities with the New York City Police Department, the New York City Partnership, National Institute for Citizen Education and the Law, the New York City Coalition for Law and Citizenship Education, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, and Queens College Law School. He indicated that these agencies and institutions played various roles in relation to the project. The New York City Police Department, for example, contributed the services of the program director and the police officers. Queens College Law School interns worked at approximately ten high schools, where they did legal research and set up mock trials to assist the teacher and police officer in the classroom.

TRAINING

As a result of the delay in funding, it was not possible for the program staff to conduct the training that had been scheduled for the summer prior to the start of the 1985-86 school year. As a result, classes began a full semester prior to the first training session. In January, 1986, new officers met for five days of instructional training and all participating teachers and police officers met for three training sessions at the same site. During July, 1986, teachers and police officers met for four days at John F. Kennedy High School. Thus, training originally intended to precede the program year became, out of necessity, training for the following year.

An O.E.A./H.S.E.U. evaluator attended one day of this four-day curriculum development/staff training workshop. About 50 police officers and teachers met for a combination of orientation, general staff development, and training in the use of curriculum materials, which were under development at that time. The evaluator observed a series of large-group presentations on specific lesson plans and larger curriculum focal points. Some of the speakers were police administrators dealing with non-curriculum issues. A small group was working at developing lesson plans and revising a cognitive test developed to assess knowledge of course content. Much of the curriculum development had been done earlier, a lot of it during the actual conduct of the course.

There was considerable discussion. A steady theme revolved around the belief expressed by some of the police officers that the primary objective of the course was to get the students to adopt a point of view sympathetic to the police. They defined their concerns as lack of cooperation from judges, inefficiency of the criminal justice system, criticisms of the police by the media and the public, and hostility of racial minorities toward the police. Several expressed puzzlement at how little change seemed to have taken place in the students' attitudes as a result of the courses. A few of the teachers maintained that they were trying to get the students to think about police-related issues with more information, sophistication, and objectivity. Most of

ED288767

POLICE/SCHOOL LIAISON PROJECT

1985-86

END-OF-YEAR REPORT

OEA Evaluation Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard Guttenberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SO 018 412

the participants who spoke were extremely positive about the experience.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

During the summer of 1986, curriculum and video production committees met four days a week for several weeks. These committees consisted of 17 police officers, nine teachers, and two assistant principals for social studies. Video committee members developed and produced a videotape. Curriculum committee members revised previously-developed curriculum material and developed new written material. They produced the nearly-1,000 page American Government and Criminal Justice System Curriculum Guide and an hour-long videotape.

The videotape contains seven short segments. They involve such issues as due process, different kinds of criminal offenses, and police procedures. Each segment concludes with a series of questions for classroom discussion.

It is clear that a great deal of work went into the video production effort. In general, the incidents depicted are relevant to high school students, involving characters from their age group, and often utilizing a school or school grounds setting. However, the final product does not reflect professional video expertise. Several segments are visually static and are edited in shots that are too long for optimal retention of viewer interest. The visual narrative is at times ambiguous even when coupled with an explanatory sound track.

The curriculum guide contains 85 lessons. It includes charts and graphs, newspaper and magazine articles, selected readings from books, and extensive excerpts from the Police Student's Guide; most of these are followed by discussion questions. Each lesson contains at least two performance objectives, several central concepts, a content outline, and a listing of suggested activities.

The curriculum guide is divided into seven units. The first four deal with comparative government, the U.S. Constitution, and state and local government. Sixty percent of the guide consists of two units: Criminology and Criminal Law, and Role of the Police in Our Criminal Justice System. A final unit describes the School Program to Educate and Control Drug Abuse. The appendices include suggested themes for law and criminal justice papers, a glossary, a bibliography, and recommended audio-visual materials.

The guide contains a great deal of potentially useful material. The introduction, for example, discusses the inquiry or problem-solving approach to teaching which encourages students to be actively involved in the learning process. The units which follow include reprints and other curriculum material designed to stimulate student thinking about legal issues.

The guide's format, however, does not facilitate its use as a curriculum manual or resource. Its table of contents lists the titles of the seven units, but not the contents of each. As a result, teachers have no ready way to locate specific lessons or reprints within units whose length ranges from 30 to 250 pages.

The guide is more a compendium of materials than a curriculum manual. It contains more lessons than there are class sessions in a semester and each lesson contains more material than can be covered in a single class session. This wealth of material could enable teachers to probe deeply into any number of issues. However, it does not provide guidance as to which lessons are most important to cover or what approximate percentage of lessons from each unit should be taught. Teachers are given so many options that they could construct many different curricula for their students that would not necessarily cover a common set of course objectives.

III. STUDENT OUTCOMES

ATTITUDE SURVEY

P.S.L.P. staff developed a student survey consisting of 25 positive statements regarding criminal justice agencies. It contained a five-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" (one) to "strongly disagree" (five). Program staff administered the same survey prior to classroom instruction (pretest) and at the end of the course (posttest). Student names appeared on the completed surveys. The P.S.L.P. administrator supplied O.E.A./H.S.E.U. with data for 221 program students from seven schools. Forty-three percent of these students had both pretest and posttest survey data. Only these students could be included in analyses of attitude changes.

In general, students expressed favorable attitudes toward criminal justice agencies. The average rating was 2.3 on the pretest and 2.2 on the posttest.* The mean difference between the attitude survey pretest and posttest was not statistically significant ($t = 1.38$; $df = 95$; $p > .05$). These responses indicate that, on average, students agreed with the positive statements in the attitude survey on both pre- and posttests. Students' most common rating (35 percent) on both pretest and posttest was "agree" (two). A response of "disagree" (four) was

---

*O.E.A./H.S.E.U. computed reliability coefficients for the pretest and posttest separately for the students with complete survey data. Using a measure of internal consistency, alpha, the reliability coefficients were determined to be high, ($r = .79$) for the pretest and ($r = .80$) for the posttest, indicating that, in general, the 25 survey items were measuring the same thing.

uncommon (nine percent) and, with one exception, a response of "strongly disagree" (five) was very rare (three percent).*

Most of the items did not show a positive response shift. However, the lack of statistical significance indicates that these shifts might have been due to chance variation. Certainly, students' attitude might have changed as a result of the course. Other explanations are possible, however. Because pretest responses were so positive, little room was left for positive change on the posttest.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE EXAMINATION

P.S.L.P. staff also developed a single criminal justice examination which staff used as pretest and posttest. Staff administered the test to program students only; they did not give it to a comparison group of students who did not take the P.S.L.P. course. Of the program students in the sample (N = 221), 48 percent had both pretest and posttest scores. Student performance on the 50-item examination improved significantly from an average pretest score of 21.6 to an average posttest score of 32.8 (t = 13.24; df = 106; $p > .05$). Although this improvement is impressive, without results from a comparison group of non-program students, it is impossible to determine whether the improvement is the result of classroom experience.

**Students responded "strongly disagree" 28 percent of the time to the statement, "Some day I would like to be a police officer." More students selected this response on the pretest (31 percent) than on the posttest (26 percent). This item represents the only shift of five percent in the direction of "strongly disagree."

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions about the success of P./S.L.P. in meeting its objectives are limited by the fact that O.E.A./H.S.E.U. could only assess the program retrospectively. The program met its objectives of establishing partnerships with educational agencies, training teachers and police officers in course content, methods, and materials, and developing curriculum materials.

Although the program's nearly 1,000-page guide contains a wealth of useful material, it has shortcomings. While allowing teachers opportunities for flexibility and creativity, the guide does not give a clear shape to the course. The result is a compendium of material that leaves teachers on their own to make such potentially disparate decisions that courses taught at different schools might bear little resemblance to each other.

The videotape lacked certain production qualities needed to convey its incidents in a way that was both clear and involving for students. These problems reduce its effectiveness as a stimulus for classroom discussion.

Students did not show any statistically-significant improvement in their attitudes toward the criminal justice system. Although program students improved their knowledge of legal issues, testing procedures did not allow for clear causal attribution of this improvement to course participation. Flaws in the attitude survey itself and in the administration of both the survey and the criminal justice examination raised questions

about the validity of survey and examination results. The inclusion in the survey of only positive statements about law enforcement agencies may have suggested to students that there was a "correct" or "acceptable" response to each. The lack of anonymity on attitude surveys which were collected by the authority figures who graded students further compromised any effort to get honest responses. The failure to have a control group of non-program students complete the survey and the knowledge examination made it impossible to assess whether changes were due to program participation or to other unrelated factors.

On the basis of the evaluation findings, the following recommendations are aimed at enhancing program benefits and facilitating their assessment:

- The curriculum guide should be revised to stipulate course priorities and requirements and indicate the approximate number of class periods needed to complete each lesson.
- The curriculum guide should be bound in separate units, each preceded by a complete table of contents.
- Any attempts to assess changes in students' attitudes or knowledge should involve both program students and a control group of non-program students.
- Students should retain their anonymity when filling out attitude surveys.
- Attitude surveys should contain statements keyed in both a positive and a negative direction.

APPENDIX

ITEM ANALYSIS OF P./S.L.P. ATTITUDE SURVEY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE EXAMINATION

As part of its 1985-86 P./S.L.P. evaluation, O.E.A./H.S.E.U. examined the reliability of the program's attitude survey and examination. These analyses are summarized in this appendix.

ATTITUDE SURVEY

P./S.L.P. staff developed an attitude survey consisting of 25 positive statements regarding criminal justice agencies and using a five-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" (one) to "strongly disagree" (five). They administered the same survey as pretest and posttest. Ninety-six students had both pretest and posttest survey data and could therefore be included in the O.E.A./H.S.E.U. analysis.

Because the posttest is designed to represent changes in student attitudes which result from the program, the reliability of individual items was examined in detail for the posttest. O.E.A./H.S.E.U. performed a statistical analysis whereby each of the 25 survey items was correlated with the remaining 24. For example, item one was correlated with items two through 25 combined. The results of this analysis, designated the corrected item-total correlation, are presented in Appendix Table 1 for each of the 25 survey items. O.E.A./H.S.E.U. determined that any item with a corrected item-total correlation below .30 was too weak for internal consistency purposes. As indicated in Appendix

APPENDIX TABLE 1

Attitude Survey Posttest: Corrected Item-Total Correlation for 25 Survey Items

Survey Item[a]	Correlation Coefficient
1	.50
2	.47
3	.46
4	.62
5	.33
6	.36
7	.51
8	.39
9	.64
10	.43
11	.45
12	.33
13	.38
14	.35
15	.35
16	.26*
17	.13*
18	.26*
19	.37
20	.19*
21	.43
22	.32
23	.23*
24	.15*
25	.13*

[a]Students rated each item on a five-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" (one) to "strongly disagree" (five).

*An asterisk indicates a correlation below the suggested .30 cut-off point for inclusion in the survey.

- Seven items had corrected-item total correlations below .30, the suggested cut-off for inclusion in the survey.

Table 1, seven items (16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, and 25) had corrected item-total correlations below .30.

The mean responses for the attitude survey pretest are presented in Appendix Table 2. A number of items (5, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 23, 24) with mean ratings between "strongly agree" (one) and "agree" (two) were represented by a mean rating of less than 2.0.

Some items provided poor measures of student attitudes. Item 15, for example ("The police try to decrease the criminal behavior in the streets") is a statement of the obvious. Although some people may believe that police make no effort, it would be surprising if most people did not agree with this statement. Item 11 ("If I saw a crime committed, I would report it to the police") is an example of an item which suggests a positive response. Regardless of whether these students would call the police to report a crime, it looks good to say that they would.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE EXAMINATION

O.E.A./H.S.E.U. conducted an item analysis of the criminal justice examination for the 107 students with complete pretest and posttest data. All but three of the 50 test items were four-choice multiple choice questions; the others were five-choice questions. It was expected that students would answer 47 items correctly approximately 25 percent of the time by chance alone. Students demonstrated some knowledge of the material; prior to any classroom experience, with better than chance performance

APPENDIX TABLE 2

Mean Responses
for the Attitude Survey Pretest

Survey Item	Mean[a]
1	2.5
2	2.3
3	2.9
4	2.6
5	1.9*
6	2.8
7	2.7
8	2.4
9	2.1
10	2.5
11	1.9*
12	2.8
13	1.8*
14	3.5
15	1.9*
16	2.5
17	1.8*
18	1.7*
19	2.4
20	2.0
21	2.2
22	2.0
23	1.9*
24	1.9*
25	2.4*

[a]Students rated each item on a five-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" (one) to "strongly disagree" (five).

* An asterisk indicates a mean pretest rating below the suggested 2.0 cut-off point for inclusion in the survey.

- Eight items had mean pretest ratings less than 2.0, the suggested cut-off point for inclusion in the survey.

on the pretest; on the average, students answered 43 percent of the questions correctly.

Examination performance for the 50 items on the pretest is illustrated in Appendix Table 3. Students correctly answered several items most of the time on the pretest, indicating that perhaps these were easy questions. Students correctly answered 22 of the 50 items more than half of the time. They correctly answered one item 88 percent of the time on the pretest; they knew that a person may not use physical force to resist arrest under any circumstance. O.E.A./H.S.E.U. identified items (1, 13, 14, 15, 41, 44, 45, 48) which students answered correctly over 67 percent of the time as "too easy."

Examination of performance for the 50 posttest items are provided in Appendix Table 4. Near or below chance performance was evident for only one posttest item. Students answered item nine correctly only 22 percent of the time on the posttest; students had apparently not learned that "Bill could not be charged with a crime for recklessly damaging a $200 window." The students' lack of knowledge of this material might be due not to a bad test item, but to the way in which teachers presented this information.

The change in the percentage of students answering the examination questions correctly from pretest to posttest is represented in Appendix Table 5. For two of the items, performance was considerably worse on the posttest than on the pretest. Students correctly answered item 15, which pertained to larceny,

APPENDIX TABLE 3

Summary of Students' Responses to Each of the Pretest Exam Items

Item	Number Correct	Number Incorrect	Percent Correct	Item	Number Correct	Number Incorrect	Percent Correct
1	78	29	72.9*	26	32	75	29.9
2	66	41	61.7	27	56	51	52.3
3	48	59	44.9	28	46	61	43.0
4	19	88	17.8	29	23	84	21.5
5	48	59	44.9	30	29	78	27.1
6	55	52	51.4	31	45	62	42.1
7	46	61	43.0	32	47	60	43.9
8	67	40	62.6	33	44	63	41.1
9	3	104	2.8	34	33	74	30.8
10	48	59	44.9	35	65	42	60.7
11	40	67	37.4	36	46	61	43.0
12	67	40	62.6	37	71	36	66.4
13	94	13	87.9*	38	69	38	64.5
14	73	34	68.2*	39	11	96	10.3
15	25	82	76.6*	40	18	89	16.8
16	23	84	21.5	41	76	31	71.0*
17	41	66	38.3	42	70	37	65.4
18	50	57	46.7	43	61	46	57.0
19	21	86	19.6	44	74	33	69.2*
20	21	86	19.6	45	76	31	71.0*
21	59	48	55.1	46	26	81	24.3
22	48	59	44.9	47	62	45	57.9
23	10	97	9.3	48	79	28	73.8
24	44	63	41.1	49	17	90	15.9
25	29	78	27.1	50	9	98	8.4

*An asterisk indicates that at least 67 percent of the students answered the item correctly.

- Over two-thirds of the students answered six items on the pretest correctly, suggesting that these items may be "too easy."

APPENDIX TABLE 4

Summary of Students' Responses to Each of the Posttest Exam Items

Item	Number Correct	Number Incorrect	Percent Correct	Item	Number Correct	Number Incorrect	Percent Correct
1	91	16	85.0	26	75	32	70.1
2	80	27	74.8	27	72	35	67.3
3	74	33	69.2	28	65	42	60.7
4	63	44	58.9	29	42	65	39.3
5	80	27	74.8	30	51	56	47.7
6	88	19	82.2	31	61	46	57.0
7	78	29	72.9	32	67	40	62.6
8	93	14	86.9	33	64	43	59.8
9	24	83	22.4*	34	61	46	57.0
10	78	29	72.9	35	87	20	81.3
11	74	33	69.2	36	70	37	65.4
12	92	15	86.0	37	88	19	82.2
13	95	12	88.8	38	81	26	75.7
14	92	15	86.0	39	53	54	49.5
15	55	52	51.4	40	43	64	40.2
16	71	36	66.4	41	83	24	77.6
17	59	48	55.1	42	89	18	83.2
18	72	35	67.3	43	83	24	77.6
19	42	65	39.3	44	92	15	86.0
20	60	47	56.1	45	82	25	76.6
21	90	17	84.1	46	53	54	49.5
22	63	44	58.9	47	76	31	71.0
23	62	45	57.9	48	64	43	59.8
24	72	35	67.3	49	52	55	48.6
25	65	42	60.7	50	40	67	62.6

*An asterisk indicates that fewer than one-fourth of the students answered this item correctly.

- Students answered item nine correctly less than one-fourth of the time on the posttest, suggesting that it might be removed from the examination.

APPENDIX TABLE 5

Net Change from Examination Pretest to Posttest of Percentage of Students Answering Items Correctly

Item	% Change	Item	% Change
1	12.1	26	40.2
2	13.1	27	15.0
3	24.3	28	17.7
4	41.1	29	17.8
5	29.9	30	20.6
6	30.8	31	14.9
7	29.9	32	18.7
8	24.3	33	18.7
9	19.6	34	26.2
10	28.0	35	20.6
11	31.8	36	22.4
12	23.4	37	15.8
13	0.9	38	11.2
14	17.8	39	39.2
15	-25.2	40	23.4
16	44.9	41	6.6
17	16.8	42	17.8
18	20.6	43	20.6
19	19.7	44	16.8
20	36.5	45	5.6
21	29.0	46	25.2
22	14.0	47	13.1
23	48.6	48	-14.0
24	26.2	49	32.7
25	33.6	50	54.2

- Performance on items 15 and 48 was considerably worse on the posttest than on the pretest.

over 76 percent of the time on the pretest and 51 percent of the time on the posttest. Students correctly answered item 48, which pertained to sexual misconduct, 74 percent of the time on the pretest and 60 percent of the time on the posttest. Based on pretest data, O.E.A./H.S.E.U. classified these two item as "too easy." It is not clear why students had more difficulty with these items on the posttest; perhaps a considerable number made lucky guesses on the pretest.

SUGGESTED CHANGES

Attitude Survey

Survey items with pretest mean ratings near 2.5, the midpoint of the scale should be maintained because they allow room for change on the posttest which lends itself to an evaluation of the influence of the course. The survey items that correlate best with the remaining items on the posttest should be maintained since they are the items responsible for high internal consistency. The items with a corrected item-total below .30 and those with a mean pretest rating less than 2.0 should be eliminated from the survey.

Half of the items should be keyed in the negative direction. Instead of "strongly agree" representing the most favorable response for all of the items, half of them should have "strongly disagree" as the most favorable response to the criminal justice agencies. For example, the statement that "All police are lazy" would require a negative response if students wanted to respond

favorably toward police. This would control for possible response bias in that some students tend to be agreeable.

The midpoint response, "somewhat agree," should be eliminated. It is not a true midpoint since it is a statement of agreement. In addition, an even number of possible choices would eliminate the possibility of "fence sitting"; there are always people who do not wish to commit themselves one way or another.

Finding 25 items that meet all of the above objectives can be difficult. One method of finding the best 25 items would include pilot testing. Perhaps about 100 questions could be given to a large number of students in sets of 25. These students need not be part of the program, but they should be as similar as possible to the students who do end up in the program (e.g., same grade). These items can be evaluated for reliability, and to see if they have an average value near the midpoint of the scale. The best 25 can be retained and P./S.L.P. can be evaluated appropriately.

Criminal Justice Examination

The items which students answered correctly on the pretest over 67 percent of the time should be removed from the examination. O.E.A./ H.S.E.U. analysis indicates that these questions are too easy.

There appears to be no advantage to pretesting students on material they have not been taught. The best way to see if program students have learned the material as a result of program participation is to test them and a control group of non-program

students once at the end of the program. Participating students would be expected to outperform non-program students. However, it should be made certain that the control subject are equated with the course students for grade and academic ability; otherwise an unfair comparison might result.